



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

# THE PHILOSOPHY OF THE MEXICAN REVOLUTIONS.

BY M. ROMERO, MEXICAN MINISTER TO THE UNITED STATES.

---

It is always very difficult for the outside world to understand well and fully appreciate the real condition of things in a country, and more specially so when that country is in an abnormal state, that is, passing through a period of serious disturbances. This is still more difficult regarding Mexico, whose peculiar conditions make it so different from all other countries, that sometimes even educated Mexicans cannot properly understand the real situation of their country, unless they have made a special study of such matters. In this way I account for the general impression prevailing in the outside world, that because Mexico has been troubled by a long series of civil wars, which lasted for over half a century, we were constitutionally disposed to fight and did so without any plausible cause or reason; but such a view is a great mistake, and a few remarks will, I hope, explain the philosophy of our civil wars.

During the Spanish rule in Mexico, which lasted for three centuries, there were three controlling privileged classes, the people counting for nothing at all. The first was the clergy, who, by obtaining bequests from persons who were dying, and in several other ways, had accumulated a very large fortune, owning directly or through mortgages almost two-thirds of the whole real estate of the country, and so absorbed the principal money business. Their power depended not only upon their immense wealth, but on their religious influence, and on their being the only educated class, for though they knew but little, it was a great deal more than the other classes did, as they were kept in the most profound ignorance. Their thorough discipline assisted the clergy very materially in wielding great influence. The clergy were so powerful during the Spanish rule, that a Viceroy tried once to enforce his authority on a recalcitrant Archbishop of the City of Mexico by ar-

resting him and sending him to Spain. He succeeded in making the arrest; but the moment it was known that the Archbishop was on his way to Vera Cruz, the people rebelled in such serious manner that he was soon brought back to the City of Mexico, and the Viceroy had to leave the country.

The second privileged class were the Spaniards by birth, who formed a kind of aristocracy, some of them having titles, and being the only ones holding office of trust, responsibility or profit in the country, and who monopolized the principal commercial business, and were also a rich class. They were so jealous of the native Mexicans that even the children of a Spaniard by a Mexican mother, born in Mexico, were not considered on the same footing as the Spaniard; they were called creoles, had no rights at all, and could not fill any public office of any importance, nor have any position. But few Spanish women ever came to Mexico. The men generally came whilst they were young, grew up in the country, and married Mexican women, very seldom pure-blooded Indians, and generally the daughters of Spaniards by Mexican mothers, born in Mexico. Of these unions came the creole.

The third class was the army, which was comparatively small, but was a very important element in the country, and native Mexicans were usually in very subordinate positions, though in a few cases only admitted among the commissioned officers.

These three classes, were, of course, decidedly attached to the Spanish rule, because under it they prospered and had all the wealth and power they could possibly wish for, while any change might endanger their position and welfare. The higher clergy were, of course, heartily loyal to Spain, while a few members of the lower clergy, Mexicans by birth—the church being the only career open to the natives—who, having on the other hand some patriotic feelings, were the only ones who could appreciate the condition of things, longed for a change.

The opposition of the clergy to independence and the alarm with which they viewed that movement were so great that their leaders were excommunicated by all the bishops of the country the moment the insurrection broke out. The Inquisition commenced proceedings against them, and several members of the higher clergy took up arms against the independent cause. The Bishop of Oaxaca, forgetting the teachings of the founder of his religion, organized his clergy, when he heard that Morelos was

going to attack the city, into a regiment to fight against the insurgents; but the martial prelate had no occasion to come into conflict with the insurgents, as he fled from the city as the enemy approached it.

The Spaniards disregarded so much the interest of their colonies, that they would not allow the Mexicans to raise the same fruits they had at home, like grapes and olives, etc., and that is the reason why we do not produce yet as much wine and olives as we otherwise could. It was only after our independence was accomplished that we began to cultivate those fruits.

The example of the United States, and even that of Spain,—where the people rebelled against the government established by Napoleon in 1808, under his brother, Joseph Bonaparte, notwithstanding that it had the sanction of King Ferdinand VII. who had abdicated in favor of the French Emperor—could not but affect the Spanish colonies in America, and most of them proclaimed their independence in 1810.

Independence was proclaimed in Mexico on September 15, 1810, in Dolores, an Indian village in the State of Guanajuato, by Miguel Hidalgo y Costilla, the aged curate of the town, assisted by Allende, Aldama and Abasalo, three inferior officers of the Mexican militia. His undertaking had all the leading classes of Mexico arrayed against it. He collected a very large number of Indians and peasants, and a few of the militia regiments followed his lead. To raise the public enthusiasm on his side, he had to put his cause under the protection of the Virgin of Guadalupe, who is supposed to have preternaturally appeared two hundred years before to a humble Indian, near the City of Mexico, and was highly revered in the country. His men were unorganized, without arms, ammunition or discipline, and although he captured some very important towns, made some headway, and under a good military leadership he might have accomplished a great deal more, availing himself of the popular enthusiasm for independence and of the surprise and discomfiture of the Spaniards, the organization and discipline of the Spanish army soon prevailed and he was defeated, captured, degraded by the higher clergy, and shot on July 31, 1811.

Hidalgo was succeeded by another priest, a full-blooded Indian, José Maria Morelos, who had in him the elements of a

great warrior, who organized a government, convened a congress which issued a constitution, defeated the Spaniards in several drawn battles and sustained for several months, against great odds, the famous siege in Cuautla, near the City of Mexico. Morelos fought the Spaniards with various successes from 1810 to 1815, when he was defeated, captured, degraded and shot.

The tendency of the Mexican revolution and its leaders will be shown by stating that Hidalgo issued on December 6, 1810, not quite three months after he had proclaimed independence from Spain, a decree abolishing slavery in Mexico, and that our first Congress, which met in Chilpancingo, in 1813, issued at Apatzingan on October 22, 1814, a constitution, and decreed at the same time the abolition of slavery. The abolition, of course, could only be enforced in the few places which were occupied by the insurgents; but when independence was achieved, one of the first acts of the first Mexican Congress, convened at the City of Mexico to adopt a constitution, was to issue a decree on July 13, 1824, which abolished slavery, and it was then actually abolished. In fact, every Mexican is born a strong anti-slavery man, so much so that we could not understand why this country should have accepted slavery and should have tried to sustain and extend it even at the cost of a tremendous civil war, which imperilled the very existence of the United States, and the great influence that they have to exert upon the destinies of mankind; especially when the very Declaration of American Independence contains the principle that all men are born free and equal, and slavery is a contradiction of that great principle. But, fortunately, slavery has been abolished here as it was in Mexico over seventy years ago, and the stain, which for some time tarnished the fair name of this country, has in that way been entirely obliterated.

When Morelos disappeared from the field, the war of independence was almost over. A few leaders remained, conspicuously among them Vicente Guerrero, Nicolas Bravo and others, patriotic and generous men, who kept up the war to the end, favored by the topographical conditions and the climate of the southern section of Mexico, which, being quite mountainous and sickly, did not allow the Spanish troops to make much headway. Early in 1817 General Mina, a Spanish patriot of broad-minded liberal views, brought to Mexico a small expedition, very much like the one brought here by General Lafayette to

fight for independence, was joined by many Mexicans, and had for some time a brilliant triumphal march ; but he was soon defeated, captured, and shot, as the Spaniards did not give any quarter.

Such was the condition of things when, in 1820, the Spaniards at Madrid restored the liberal constitution adopted by the Cortes in 1812, when King Ferdinand VII. had fled from Spain and the country was in possession of the French, and that fact alarmed very much the conservative Spanish element in Mexico, who, fearing that liberal principles might find a foothold in the mother country, thought that it was better for them to proclaim independence from Spain and establish a Catholic monarchy under a Spanish king, so that they would not be subject to the obnoxious changes which liberal ideas, that had begun to permeate Spain, might bring about. They went, therefore, to Iturbide, who, although a native Mexican, had been one of the leaders of the Spanish army against the insurrection, was a good soldier and an ambitious man. Iturbide accepted their plan, and, when appointed by the Viceroy to command the army sent to subdue the southern revolutionary leaders, he took all the available forces and money of the Viceroy and joined Guerrero and the other revolutionary leaders, proclaiming on February 24, 1821, a platform called *Plan de Jquala*, which was a compromise between the revolution and its opponents, as it accomplished independence, but under a thoroughly Catholic monarchy with a Spanish prince on the throne, and forbidding the exercise of any other religion. All the other commanding officers of the Spanish army in other sections of the country accepted that platform, and, after that, independence was of course accomplished almost without a blow. An incoming Viceroy accepted the plan of Jquala and signed at Cordova on August 24 of that year, but the Spanish Government repudiated that treaty and Iturbide was then crowned Emperor of Mexico in May, 1822.

So the movement for independence, which, in the other Spanish colonies, came from the higher classes, in Mexico sprang up originally from the lower classes, with the higher classes opposing it, and so the first movement was an apparent failure, because it did not have the support of the higher classes. But as soon as it became for the interest of the higher classes themselves that Mexico should be independent of Spanish rule, their influence turned the scale, and independence was at once achieved.

But the Mexican patriots, who had been fighting for ten years in favor of independence, material progress, and liberal principles, could not be satisfied with the success of their former enemies and the establishment of an empire. They thought that this was depriving the country and themselves of the fruits of their victory, and so they rebelled against Iturbide and inaugurated a revolution which finally overthrew the empire and made Iturbide fly from the country after a reign of about ten months. After that, was renewed the old hostility between the two parties—the Liberal party, which had been the promoter of independence and desired progress, and the Conservative or Church party, which intended to maintain the *status quo*, and was decidedly averse to any changes. It is not strange that the conflict between these two parties, representing such antagonistic ideas, should have lasted so long.

After Iturbide's downfall, the Liberals summoned a national congress, which issued, on January 31, 1824, the preliminary basis of a Federal Constitution, and on October 4, of the same year, the Constitution itself was finally adopted and promulgated. It was patterned after the Constitution of the United States and was almost a copy of it, and I do not know whether, in imitating so closely the institutions of this country, we did not make a mistake. The constitution of a nation should be adapted to the conditions of that country. Here, in the northern section of the continent, there were at the end of last century thirteen colonies independent from each other, which made war against England, achieved their independence, and then found themselves little more than a confederacy of infantile nations, with all the weaknesses which ever have attended a simple confederation. They, therefore, decided to consolidate themselves into a strong nation, under the name of "The United States of America." The federal system of government was the only solution of the problems which confronted then the people of this country. It was the natural and inevitable outgrowth of the condition of things existing before the adoption of the Constitution. In Mexico, there was a united country, subject to the same authorities and laws, and with only one head. In adopting a republican federal system there, the nation had to be artificially divided up into separate sections, to be called states, which had no separate existence before, and no individual history or experience in self-government. It is not to be wondered at, therefore,

that when this constitution went into operation, it caused great disturbance. It is easy to find in this fact one of the causes of our prolonged civil wars. We were not alone in suffering such misfortunes, for almost every other nation on this continent following in our footsteps, tried to adapt the republican-federal system to a condition of things to which it was not suited. Brazil alone escaped this period of turmoil and experiment by establishing an empire, with a scion of the reigning house of Portugal on the throne, and by not adopting a federal-republican form of government until nearly a century later, after the people had acquired some ideas of self-government, and some capacity for carrying it out ; and it is probably for these reasons that she has suffered less by civil commotions than any other country of similar origin in this hemisphere.

Our Constitution of 1824 was a decided victory for the Liberal party, but very far from being a final one. The Church party, though then defeated, was really the stronger of the two during the early years of independent Mexico. The Liberal victory did not last long, and the Conservative or Church party prevailed upon some of Mexico's numerous military leaders to rebel against the government and inaugurate a series of revolutions, which ended in 1835 in the overthrow of the Constitution of 1824. The military leaders began to play a very important part in public affairs. One of the worst effects of a successful revolution is that it sanctions the principle that brutal force shall prevail, and gives rise to personal ambition of unscrupulous and successful soldiers. One instance of this result is the case of General Santa Anna, of Mexico. He was an ambitious, unprincipled, selfish man, who sided with all the parties and deceived them all. He was a successful military leader in an irregular guerilla warfare, but had no ability as a soldier. He fought with the Spanish army against the independent cause up to 1821, when he went over to Iturbide when he joined the independent leaders; in 1822 he rebelled against Iturbide and proclaimed a Federal Republic, and in 1834 he abolished the Federal Constitution of 1824, and established a military dictatorship. From 1822 to 1855 he actually had the fate of Mexico in his hands, having been President five different times, but never did any good to the country, excepting his readiness to take part in our foreign war. He began his political career as a Radical Lib-



eral, and ended it as the most reactionary leader of the Church party. He often was very easily discouraged and more than once fled from the country, forsaking a power which he might have wielded longer, showing that he lacked tenacity of purpose. But such an instance as this does not show, as a superficial observer might be disposed to believe, that the struggle was only on account of personal ambition of unscrupulous military leaders, as what really happened was that the political parties used these leaders for their convenience, and had, of course, to share the power with them.

When the Church party had the ascendancy, they repealed the Federal Constitution of 1824, and on October 23, 1835, they issued some bases for a new constitution, which was finally proclaimed on December 29, 1836, under the title of Constitutional Laws, which abolished the federal system of government, and several of the liberal features of the Federal Constitution of 1824. The Constitutional Laws of 1836 did not seem to be conservative enough for the Church party, and they issued, on June 13, 1843, what was called the "Organic Bases"—a more conservative constitution.

As the Church party was so rich and so strong, and had so much influence in the country, it could very easily have brought about a civil war of such seriousness as would have been very difficult for the Liberal side to overcome; but, as time elapsed, the Liberal party, which really represented the patriotic element of the country, grew stronger with education and contact with foreign nations, and was materially assisted in its task by the demoralization of the clergy and their unpatriotic conduct during our foreign wars—as, besides our civil wars, we had, in 1828, a war against Spain, who sent an expedition to reconquer Mexico; in 1838, a war with France; in 1846 and 1847 a war with the United States, and from 1861 to 1867, the war of the French intervention. It was not difficult, therefore, for the Liberal party to inaugurate in their turn a counter-revolution, which was at last successful, and which finally restored them to power. It was in that way that the period of our civil wars continued for so long, and that we came to have so many different constitutions.

Finally, on May 18, 1847, the Federal Constitution of 1824 was restored, with some amendments, and the Liberal party

regained power, which they kept until 1853, when Santa Anna returned to Mexico, called back by a successful revolution of the Church party, and established a dictatorship of the most reactionary kind. But the Liberals rebelled against him in 1854, proclaiming the plan of Ayutla, and in 1855 Santa Anna fled from the country, because the Church in whose interest he was administering the government would not give him the money he required to carry out the war. A federal government was then established under General Alvarez first, and General Comonfort afterwards. General Alvarez appointed Benito Juarez Secretary of Justice, and on November 23, 1855, Juarez issued the first law against the clergy which deprived them of the civil privileges they were enjoying. Under the Spanish rule, and also after the independence of Mexico, up to that date, the clergy had special courts made up of clergymen, to try them for any offence that they might commit. This was a privilege which insured them almost perfect immunity and exempted them from the control of the laws of the country. The Liberals thought that that was a great outrage, but they could not change that condition of things until the Juarez law of 1855. The army enjoyed similar privileges, of which the Juarez law deprived them by restricting the jurisdiction of military courts to only military offences.

Juarez was a most remarkable man. He was a full-blooded Indian, born in a small town inhabited only by Indians, and where there was but one man—the parish priest—who spoke Spanish and could read and write. Juarez was so anxious to learn Spanish and to acquire an education, that he offered his services as a domestic to the priest, under condition that he should be taught. The priest found him so intelligent that he sent him to the adjoining city of Oaxaca to be educated. From such humble beginnings he rose to be a prominent lawyer and a foremost statesman. He was, at different times, Secretary of State of his own state, Member of the State Legislature, State Senator, Governor of his state for several terms, Representative to the Federal Congress, Secretary of Justice and of the Interior, Chief Justice, Vice-President, and finally President of the Republic. His principal characteristics were his profound conviction of liberal principles, his very clear mind, his remarkably good common sense, his great moral courage, his unimpeached integrity and

honesty, his great patriotism, his tenacity of purpose and devotion to civil government. In time of war, when the destinies of the country were in his hands and often depended on the result of a battle, and when many others in his place would have led an army, he purposely abstained from exercising any military duties. These he left entirely to those of his associates who had shown talent for war, and he himself set the example of a purely civil government. He had as much personal courage as any man in the world. I saw him more than once facing death as near and sure as any man ever did, with perfect calmness and almost indifference, but without bravado. I am sure he felt that it is best for a patriot to die in the service of his country, because in that case he wins for himself immortality, and on this theory I account for the fact that he was never afraid to die if he died while in the performance of a patriotic duty.\*

The Juarez law was succeeded by the Lerdo law, which provided that no corporation—meaning the clergy, as the church was the only corporation existing in Mexico—could hold real estate, and that such as was held then by any corporation should be sold to the actual tenants at a price which was to be arrived at by capitalizing the rent on the basis of six per cent. rate of interest. Thereafter, the tenant was to be the owner of the property, the corporation retaining a mortgage equal to the price fixed in this way. These two laws were the cause of two other insurrections promoted by the church and subdued by President Comonfort.

Our present Federal Constitution of February 5th, 1857, had been issued during the administration of Comonfort, and he had just taken the oath to support it, and under it he had been elected Constitutional President for a term of four years, beginning on December 1, 1857, and on the 17th of that month he rebelled against the constitution he had just sworn to support.

\* Mr. Seward's estimate of the character of Juarez, shows how the Anglo-Saxon was impressed by the little Indian. When Mr. Seward visited Mexico on his trip around the world, he was heartily welcomed by my country, and in a remarkable speech that he made in the City of Puebla, he said that Juarez was the greatest man that he had ever met in his life. His speech was taken down in shorthand, and Mr. Thomas H. Nelson, of Terre Haute, Ind., then United States Minister to Mexico, noticing this phrase and thinking that in the excitement of the moment Mr. Seward had gone further than he intended and further than he would like to have repeated after a sober second thought, took it to Mr. Seward and said to him, "Governor, will you be willing to stand by what you said in your speech, about Juarez being the greatest man you ever knew? Remember that you have been the peer and contemporary of Webster, Clay, Calhoun, and many other distinguished men of our country, and that you place Juarez above them all." Mr. Seward answered, "What I said about Juarez was after mature consideration, and I am willing to stand by my opinion." This statement has been submitted to General Nelson and found correct by him.—M. R.

Notwithstanding this and the fact that he had successfully subdued two insurrections of the church against his government, he finally allowed himself to be used as the tool of the clergy, and headed a revolution against the very constitution which he had proclaimed, and to which he owed his position.

Juarez, after the enactment of the law which bore his name, had for a time been Governor of the state of Oaxaca, and while holding that office he had been elected Chief-Justice of the Republic and *ex-officio* Vice-President, and was at the time of the Comonfort rebellion also acting as Secretary of the Interior.

Juarez became Comonfort's successor and undertook to stem the tide of rebellion and reaction. In the City of Mexico most of the old regular army of the country were in favor of the Conservative or Church party. The city, therefore, fell into the hands of Juarez's enemies and he had to fly from it. He went to the interior, where he established his government, first at Queretaro, afterwards at Guanajuato and Guadalajara. Finally he sailed from Manzanillo, a Mexican port on the Pacific, to Panama, New Orleans, and back to Vera Cruz, on the Gulf of Mexico, where he remained for about two years. Vera Cruz was the stronghold of the Liberal party as it was naturally a strong place and well fortified. It was protected also by its bad climate and the prevalence of yellow fever there, and was the best place he could have selected to establish his government. He remained at Vera Cruz from March, 1858, to January, 1861, during which time the principal cities of the country were in the hands of the Church party. The Liberal army, though often defeated, was never destroyed, for the people were with them and recruits came in abundance. After a defeat, the liberal leaders reorganized their armies and were soon ready to meet the enemy again. Their courage and persistence were finally rewarded and they were victorious in the decisive battle of Calpulalpan on December 23, 1860.

During the terrible struggle which we call the War of Reform, Juarez issued, from Vera Cruz, on July 12 and 23, 1859, our Reform Laws, which had for their object to destroy the political power that the clergy had exercised before. The church property was declared national property, and was sold by the government to the occupants of it at a nominal price, payable partially in national bonds, then selling at a very low price, about five per cent. of their face value. The clergy were then deprived of

all political rights. Their convents, both of monks and nuns, were suppressed. The number of churches existing in the country was considerably reduced. Complete independence between the church and the state was proclaimed. A civil registry of births, marriages and deaths was established, taking from the clergy all interference with such subjects, which had been up to then under their sole supervision. Processions and all other religious demonstrations outside of the church, as well as the ringing of bells, were prohibited. The number of feast days, which then amounted to nearly one-fourth of all the days of the year, and tended to keep the people in idleness, was reduced to not more than two or three for the whole year. The wearing outside of the church of the priest's peculiar habit was prohibited, and many other stringent measures against the clergy were adopted, with a view to destroy their political power and to deprive it of the means to bring about another insurrection against the government.

It is a remarkable fact that most of the Liberal leaders were lawyers, who, influenced solely by patriotism and a desire for the success of the Liberal cause and without any military education, had to lead our armies during the long civil wars. Some of them became very distinguished soldiers in our war, as happened here in the United States. So I can properly say that the final success of the Liberal cause in Mexico was due in a great measure to the jurists of the nation, and it was so much so that they incurred the special hatred of the Church party, and the name of "lawyer" was wont to be used by them as a contemptuous designation for the Liberal leaders.

After the battle of Calpulalpan, where General Miramon, the last Church party President, was defeated, Juarez left Vera Cruz and established his government at the City of Mexico. He then convened Congress, ordered an election, and in 1861 he was elected President for his first constitutional term. The Reform laws did not become operative until after Juarez occupied the City of Mexico and his rule was extended over the whole country.

The Church party did not give up the struggle, but began again with renewed vigor to start a new insurrection in 1861, directed especially against the execution of the Reform laws. Although this insurrection was not of a serious character, because the insurgents could not capture any important places or defeat

the government troops, it did succeed in keeping up an unsettled condition of things throughout the country, involving great insecurity to life and property.

When the Church party became satisfied that the Liberal party had grown so much that they did not have strength enough at home to overcome it, they went to Europe and continued their intrigues with European courts to secure a European intervention in Mexico. Unfortunately, about that time, the Civil War broke out in the United States, and insured the success of the Mexican Church leaders in obtaining the European intervention, as the French Emperor seemed quite certain of the success of the Confederacy, and was very well disposed to avail himself of the opportunity offered by the Mexican Church party of gaining a foothold in Mexico and effectually aiding in the permanent division of the United States. He had, besides, his dream of establishing a French Empire in America bordering on the Pacific. Under his influence an alliance was made between France, England, and Spain, and Maximilian was persuaded to come to Mexico. England and Spain withdrew before the war actually began, and Napoleon's first army was defeated at Puebla on May 5, 1862; but, after being considerably reinforced, he succeeded in occupying both Puebla and the City of Mexico in 1863, and so began the French intervention. The details of that intervention are quite familiar in this country, and I will not say anything more about it.

When peace was restored in the United States after the collapse of the Confederacy, Louis Napoleon, of course, understood that he could not continue for an indefinite period his occupation of Mexico, and that he had to give up his Mexican plans, and withdraw his army from the country. Maximilian well knew that he could not remain in Mexico after the withdrawal of the French, and he decided to leave the country as soon as he heard that the French army was to be withdrawn and he was satisfied that his wife's mission to Europe to obtain a revocation of the order of withdrawal was fruitless; but unfortunately he was a dreamer without force of character and he was not a man equal to the occasion. He was not steady in his resolutions, and he was persuaded by the leaders of the Church party to return to the City of Mexico after he had already started on his homeward journey and gone in October, 1866, so far as Orizaba, two-thirds of the way

between the City of Mexico and Vera Cruz, where the "Novara," the same Austrian man-of-war which had brought him to Mexico in 1864, lay ready to take him back to his native country, having been sent over at his request by the Emperor of Austria, after having generously reinstated him in his rights as Archduke of Austria and eventual heir to the throne, which he had resigned when leaving for Mexico. Early in February, 1867, Maximilian left the City of Mexico and went to Queretaro, where he was finally captured, tried and shot on June 19 following.

In July of that year the Juarez government was again restored to the City of Mexico, and another popular election took place, in which Juarez was almost unanimously elected by the people for another term from 1867 to 1871.

The patriotism and firmness of Juarez were remarkable. There was a time, during the French intervention, in which many seemed to despair of the fate of Mexico, and that feeling was not entirely unreasonable, considering that the country was invaded by a very large French army—some sixty or eighty thousand men, I think. Besides, Napoleon and Maximilian had contrived to have an Austrian auxiliary corps, a corps from Hungary, and another from Belgium—Princess Charlotte, Maximilian's wife, was a daughter of the former King of Belgium and a sister of the present King—and he had also one contingent from the French colony of Algiers, and the command of the troops of the Church party, which were on his side, and embraced most of our old regular army, and finally, he had all the aristocratic elements of Mexico in his favor. Altogether, the array was so great that it was no wonder that many of our public men had, sometimes, little hope of success. But Juarez never despaired for a second. He was perfectly certain of final success, and was ready to sacrifice his life for his country's cause.

In a country where civil war had lasted for such a long time, everything was demoralized, and so, even after our complete success against the French intervention, and the so-called empire of Maximilian, some uprisings took place, which were now headed by dissatisfied Liberal leaders, and although they were of no serious nature and were easily subdued by President Juarez, they kept the country in an unsettled condition, and contributed to support the view that we were unable to maintain peace. President Juarez died on July 18, 1872, and President Lerdo de Tejada, who

succeeded him, first as Vice-President and afterwards as constitutional President elected by the people, held the office until November, 1876, when General Diaz became President. Among the many distinguished services that General Diaz has rendered to Mexico, perhaps the principal one is to have restored complete peace to the country. During the several terms in which he has filled the executive office, he has earnestly encouraged the material development of the country, and firmly established peace and order. Material development always furnishes the best security that public peace will be maintained. It would take more space than I can conveniently occupy if I intended to give a correct idea of the great services that General Diaz has done to Mexico.

It will be readily seen by this very brief synopsis that the causes which brought about the civil wars in Mexico are now over. Ours was a contest for supremacy between the vital forces of the nation, between the old and the new ideas, which in other countries it has taken longer years, and even centuries, to settle; but now our political problem is solved, the Church party is completely broken down as a political organization and cannot cause again any serious disturbance, and the elements of civil war are now lacking. Mexico, for nearly twenty years, has been at peace and enjoying all the advantages of a permanent peace. Such persons as took part in former revolutions have either died, disappeared, or are now interested in the maintenance of peace, because they are thriving under the development of the country. Even in case President Diaz's guidance should fail Mexico, I am sure that peace would be preserved, because the interests in its favor are very strong. Railways and telegraphs are great preservers of peace. In case of an insurrection, it was not long ago that it took months before the government could reach the insurgents, and in the meantime they could organize and fortify themselves and make considerable headway before they were confronted by an enemy. Now the government can send troops at once to quell it.

Peace in Mexico is as secure as it is in any other country, and life and property are as safe there as anywhere else. Public opinion seems to share this view, and capital, especially foreign capital, which is so conservative and timid, is now being freely invested in Mexican enterprises.

M. ROMERO.